



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/521,688	08/10/2005	Christoph Nemmaier	P04,0367	1463
26574	7590	10/13/2009	EXAMINER	
SCHIFF HARDIN, LLP PATENT DEPARTMENT 233 S. Wacker Drive-Suite 6600 CHICAGO, IL 60606-6473			HON, MING Y	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/13/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/521,688	Applicant(s) NEMMAIER ET AL.	
	Examiner MING HON	Art Unit 2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 27-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 27-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's amendment filed on September 21, 2009 is acknowledged. Currently Claims 27-38

2. In regards to Claim 27 and 38, the applicant states that "Although the usage profile does contain error data, there is no suggestion anywhere in this reference of providing an error state pattern caused by a single causative error. Nowhere is there discussion anywhere of a pattern caused by a single causative error. Although a plurality of errors may be provided in the Table 1 usage profile, there is no indication to combine temporally successive error states into a temporally successive error state pattern caused by a single causative error. And there is no discussion anywhere in the reference of comparing this temporally successive error state pattern caused by a single causative error with a predetermined error state pattern where each pattern defines a temporal sequence of error states of a predetermined single error type."

The applicant also stated that " Although Bernklau at column 13, lines 36-39 talks about "analysis of combinations of usage profile tokens that present error conditions, or symptoms within a printer", there is no discussion of any such combinations being the result of a single causative error and no discussion of temporally successive error state patterns where the error states are in temporal succession to form the pattern for a single causative error."

According to the examiner's understanding of the remarks, the applicant believes that the errors detected are not considered temporally successive and the errors detected are not caused by a single causative error. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The user profile data contains data regarding the operation of the printer over a period of time. The data includes errors that occurred in the time frame as seen in the Sample Usage Profile Record (Bernklau-Halvor, Column 5 to Column 12). "The Rules Engine parses the Usage

Art Unit: 2625

Profile data, performs an analysis, and returns an error status, an error message, and a record set of solutions." (Bernklau-Halvor, Column 11, Lines 28-34) By parsing through the Usage Profile data using the Rules Engine, it is essentially finding data that are considered to be errors and since the errors occur in the same time frame, the errors determined by the Rules are considered to be temporal successive. These errors are considered successive because for the errors cannot occur at the same time such as the paper jams in multiple locations therefore they are considered successive errors. The errors are found and parsed and then by applying the Rules to the parsed errors/components. It is essentially forming a pattern or a set with the parsed data by combining parsed components to analyze. The predetermined error pattern contains values such that it will cause a comparison to have a result that will return a solution associated with the error pattern being evaluated. The Rules Engine will ultimately find a solution to an error if one exists. Finding a solution to an error requires the Rules Engine to determine an error or error type to be able to determine a solution. This error is considered to be the causative error since the solution is designed to solve that error that is causing the other errors being detected. (Bernklau-Halvor, Column 11, Lines 28-34)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 27-31, 33-34, 36 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Bernklau-Halvor USPN 6782495 and further in view of Koike et al. US2002/0098207 hereinafter referred to as Koike.

As per Claim 27, Bernklau-Halvor teaches a method for error handling in a printer or copier, comprising the steps of:

transmitting the detected error states to a coordination module which receives them; storing said received error states at a storage associated with said coordination module where combined they form a temporally successive error state pattern caused by single causative error; (Bernklau-Halvor, Column 2, Lines 27-29, the data consists of a set of print diagnostic data which consists of multiple components. The set is considered an error state pattern. Sample Usage Data starting on bottom of Column 5 to top of Column 11, displays a printer log of what occurs such as paper jam along with the status of inks and paper which would require multiple detectors since these components occur in different locations in the printer. The predetermined error pattern contains values such that it will cause a comparison to have a result that will return a solution associated with the error pattern being evaluated. Column 11, Lines 28-34; The Rules Engine will ultimately find a solution to an error if one exists. Finding a solution to an error requires the Rules Engine to determine an error or error type to be able to determine a solution. The error associated with the solution is said to be causative.)

evaluating the stored error state pattern by the coordination module; (Bernklau-Halvor, Figure 1, Component 13 located in support server, Component 10)

for said evaluation, said coordination module comparing the stored temporally successive error state pattern caused by single causative error with predetermined error state patterns, each predetermined pattern defining a sequence of error states of a predetermined single error type, and determining at least one error type identifying said single causative error; and implementing a corrective action by the coordination module dependent on the error type. (Bernklau-Halvor, Column 2, Lines 40-45 and Column 11, Lines 28-34)

Bernklau-Halvor does not explicitly teach providing a plurality of separate monitoring units each located in a different device component of the printer or copier, each monitoring unit detecting a respective error state represented by a respective error signal from said respective

Art Unit: 2625

monitoring unit of the printer or copier created by a single causative error; However Koike teaches it. (Koike, Paragraph[0014])

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Koike into Bernklau-Halvor. Bernklau-Halvor teaches a printer log that contains log of errors such as paper jam and status of inks. To effectively monitor at least these two aspects requires various monitoring units that Bernklau-Halvor did not explicitly mention. Koike teaches the use of multiple detectors such as paper detector and ink detector to monitor the internal functions of a printer. These multiple detectors will allow the printer log of Bernklau-Halvor to be accurate and complete.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the two references to obtain the invention in Claim 27.

As per Claim 28, Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike teaches a method of claim 27 wherein said corrective action comprises providing at least one corrective measure to the printer or copier. (Bernklau-Halvor, Column 11, Lines 29-33)

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 27.

As per Claim 29, Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike teaches a method of claim 27 wherein said corrective action comprises providing an error message. (Bernklau-Halvor, Column 11, Lines 29-33)

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 27.

As per Claim 30, Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike teaches a method of claim 28 wherein a plurality of corrective measures are provided by the coordination module dependent on the error type. (Bernklau-Halvor, Column 11, Lines 29-33)

Art Unit: 2625

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 28.

As per Claim 31, Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike teaches a method of claim 27 wherein said corrective action comprises providing both at least one corrective measure and at least one error message by the coordination module dependent on the error type. (Bernklau-Halvor, Column 11, Lines 29-33)

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 27.

As per Claim 33, Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike teaches a method of claim 27 wherein information about the respective error type of temporally successive error states that can be automatically remedied are stored at least in one error storage of the coordination module. (Bernklau-Halvor, Sample Usage Data starting on bottom of Column 5 to top of Column 11, for the usage profile to contain data along with errors that are determined in the log)

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 27.

As per Claim 34, Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike teaches a method of claim 27 wherein temporally successive error states transmitted up to a shut down of the printer or copier are evaluated with aid of a predetermined error evaluation algorithm. (Bernklau-Halvor, Sample Usage Data starting on bottom of Column 5 to top of Column 11, for the usage profile to contain data, the apparatus must be on. The predetermined error evaluation is the Rules engine, Column 11, Lines 27-31)

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 27.

Art Unit: 2625

As per Claim 36, Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike teaches a method of claim 27 wherein the printing or copying event is ended after the transmission of the temporally successive error states, and all of the error states transmitted up to the ending of the printer or copier copying event are stored in the storage and used for the evaluation. (Bernklau-Halvor, Sample Usage Data starting on bottom of Column 5 to top of Column 11, for the usage profile to contain data or log of activities. The predetermined error evaluation is the Rules engine, Column 11, Lines 27-31)

Analysis is analogous to that made in Claim 27.

As per Claim 38, Claim 38 is claiming a device for error handling in a printer or copier executing the steps as claimed in Claim 27. Therefore arguments and analysis are analogous to that claimed in Claim 27.

4. Claims 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernklau-Halvor USPN 6782495 and further in view of Koike et al. US2002/0098207 hereinafter referred to as Koike as applied to Claim 27 and further in view of Chiba USPN 6665088.

As per Claim 32, Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike teaches a method of claim 27. Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike does not explicitly teach wherein the controller is connected with a host system, whereby the controller only registers with the host system causative errors that cannot be corrected automatically; However Chiba teaches it. (Chiba, Column 13, Lines 29-54 and Figure 10; a error occurred and detected and the solution is automatically implemented if the condition is satisfied, the error would need to access data from the host but not inform the host of the error by going through a error identification process)

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Chiba into Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike.

Art Unit: 2625

Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike teaches an error detection process that involves identifying the error and provided solutions to the user on how to resolve the error. Not all errors need user intervention to resolve. Certain errors such as an underrun error as discussed by Chiba would have an obvious solution of resending the data again. The consultation of an error database would be unnecessary and lead to inefficient operation of the system. Chiba teaches a beneficial addition to Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the three references to obtain the invention in Claim 32.

5. Claims 35 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bernklau-Halvor USPN 6782495 and further in view of Koike et al. US2002/0098207 hereinafter referred to as Koike as applied to Claim 27 and further in view of Parry USPN 6666594.

As per Claim 35, Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike teaches a method of claim 27. Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike does not teach wherein dependent on the error type, the printer or copier is at least one of automatically restarted, an automatic start is prevented, and a signaling of the error to a subordinate controller occurs. However Parry teaches it. (Parry, Figure 3, Path from Component E3 to E7, signaling of the error is equivalent to sending the error to the controller))

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Parry into Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike. Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike teaches the ability to initiate a restart given certain conditions are met. Parry teaches the ability to send the error to the controller thus stopping the restarting from occurring since conditions weren't met. Parry and Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike are in the same endeavor of error detection and error resolution involving printer/copier errors.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the three references to obtain the invention in Claim 35.

As per Claim 37, Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike teaches a method of claim 27. Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike does not explicitly teach wherein the stored temporally successive error states are erased in the storage after the evaluation of the temporally successive error states; However Parry teaches it. (Parry, Figure 3, Components E1, E2, E3, and E4; the errors detected are sent to a memory where it is stored and evaluated. Memory modules have limited space and therefore when it reaches its limit will delete the errors to reallocate the memory for more errors)

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the teachings of Parry into Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike. It is well known in the art that memory is not limitless, at a certain point the error log will run out of memory to store more information thus erasing is the only option to maintain a log. Parry and Bernklau-Halvor in view of Koike are in the same endeavor of error detection and error resolution involving printer/copier errors.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to combine the three references to obtain the invention in Claim 37.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2625

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MING HON whose telephone number is (571)270-5245. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:30 to 6:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark K. Zimmerman can be reached on (571)272-7653. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/M. H./

Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/Mark K Zimmerman/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625